

"man himself is something good in so far as he is man, for he can live rightly when he so wills" - St. Augustine ①

"The LORD looks down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there be one who is wise and seeks God.

All alike have gone astray; they have become perverse; there is not one that does good, not even one." Psalm 14:2-3

of (I love you Jesus - please allow your love to shine in this work).
The Question of Predestination + ~~Free~~ Freewill is ~~numbered~~ among those questions that

cause many Christians to blush when asked (or more aptly put: attacked) by

skeptical intellectuals. Because of this Christianity is not without individuals

who have ^{taken} pen in hand to defend the orthodox Christian viewpoint concerning

the existence of predestination + freewill. But ~~like~~ ^{as with} many of the ^{other} "doctrines of

Faith" these well intending authors often fall short of satisfying the human

intellect or while trying to appeal to the intellect they nonetheless confess

that this matter exceeds the human ~~cap~~ capacity to understand. therefore

this paper is not an attempt to resolve the question (for that would surely be

a vain attempt) but rather to briefly present the opinion of ~~the~~ ^{of Rotterdam} the two

men: Erasmus + ~~Robert~~ Martin Luther, & ~~more importantly~~ ^{also answer the question as to} why the latter of the

two chose to depart from the orthodox understanding.

Predestination & Free Will

In my own personal dealings with ^{the} this question, I found it necessary to consult that wise ^{man} of old, an authority equally recognized & revered by both parties, St. Augustine of Hippo. Our dialogue went somewhat like this (we were discussing whether, because of Foreknowledge, God was responsible for our sin):

"Aug. - Why do you think our free will ~~is~~ is opposed to God's foreknowledge? Is it ~~not~~ because it is foreknowledge simply, or because it is God's foreknowledge?" Ev. - 'In the main because it is God's foreknowledge.'

Aug. - ~~If you knew in advance that such a man would sin, there would be no necessity for him to sin. Ev. - Indeed there would be no real foreknowledge unless I knew for certain what was going to happen.~~

Aug. - 'If you know in advance that such a man would sin, there would be no necessity for him to sin.'

Ev. - 'Indeed there ~~would~~ would, for I should have no real foreknowledge unless I knew for certain what was going to happen.' Aug. - 'So it is foreknowledge generally & not God's foreknowledge specially that causes the events foreknown to happen by necessity? There would be no such thing as foreknowledge unless there was certain foreknowledge.' Ev. - 'I agree. But why these questions?'

Aug. - 'Unless I am mistaken, you would not directly compel the man to sin, though you knew beforehand that he was going to sin. Nor does your presence in itself compel him to sin ~~but~~ even though he was certainly going to sin, as we must assume if you have real presence. So there is ~~no~~ real contradiction here. Simply you know beforehand what another is going to do with his own will. Similarly God compels no man to sin, though he sees beforehand those who are going to sin by their own will.'

② (ibid p 61)

This response interested me. ^{St.} Augustine was saying: "Yes, God has a knowledge of the 'future' (we must understand that ^{with} God there is no past & or future just an eternal now) but that doesn't mean

that he is the ~~direct~~ author of our every act, no more ~~than the fact~~ ^{than} that you ~~know~~ ^{know} ~~for a fact~~ ^{am} that tomorrow it is going to rain means that ~~you~~ ^{you} ~~are~~ ^{am} going to make it rain." (3) (ibid.) This explanation was very convincing until my mind wandered upon a rock left uninvestigated. It seems that the ~~analogy~~ analogy between God + I breaks down when one realizes that I may know that tomorrow brings rain but I had ~~nothing~~ ^{no part} in ~~or~~ creating the clouds or their given natures. I may know for a fact that "so and so" is going to sin in exactly 35 minutes, just as God knows, but the implications of that knowledge ^{is} ~~are~~ different between God + I. I did not create "so and so" or assign to him a certain nature.

Is it not, therefore, contrary to God's loving nature to create an individual with the knowledge as to whether ^{the} individual ^{shall} ever find salvation? Would it not be better that God's will be pronounced into our understanding? Is he not with- ~~holding~~ ^{holding} a blessing from us by creating us with a sin nature?

"But God did not withhold the lavishness of his ~~kindness~~ ^{kindness} even from his creatures who he knew before hand would not only sin but would continue in the will to sin; for he showed it in creating ~~them~~ ^{them}."

~~It is better than a sin nature because it is a sin nature~~
~~which is not a sin nature but a sin nature~~
~~which is not a sin nature but a sin nature~~

"(4) (ibid, p 63) - St. Augustine
in response to the ~~accusation~~ accusation that God created man with a sin nature Augustine ~~teaches~~ teaches that man in his present

^{state} sinful nature is not perfect man created by God, but Fallen man
 ^
 blemished by original sin. ⑤ (ibid, p17)

Again just as with the first ^{hypothesis} ~~argument~~ if one is not careful
^{second hypothesis}
~~at this point~~
 and fails to take a close look ~~at this point~~ then one
 runs the risk of blindly accepting ^{its} ~~its~~ conclusion. What's wrong with
^{hypothesis}
 this ~~argument~~ is that it fails to realize that God as first creator is in some
 way responsible for his creation. ~~that~~ If in creating he is conscious of its
 results & repercussions ^{he is then} ~~therefore~~, in essence, condoning
 or consenting to those ends. ⑥ The reason that I am going to such

great lengths with this argument is, first ^{to disprove} of all, ~~the~~ ^{to disprove} the idea that
^{secondly} that there is no predestination; ~~that~~ with the creator, foreknowledge is
 the same as predestination & predestination is foreknowledge. This, in turn,
 resurrects the problem that Saint Augustine was dealing with: "How

can God punish a man for sin if man sins according to his nature which
 God foreknew when he brought man into existence?" ⑦ (St. Aug. ibid p.61)
 The converse of

that question being: "Can God reward man for a good act if man
 acts only according to his God-given nature?" The next logical step is
 to ask ~~if there is a free will~~ ^{it} Does man really have a free will or
 is he just blindly acting out the pre-ordained plan or will of God?
 If this is so then does God predestine some men to go to hell? (like

Calvin).

Parmenides ~~said~~ felt that for every distance an individual travels
 he has to travel at least ^{half} ~~one~~ of that distance before completing the whole
 distance. And in turn, he must travel one half of that half distance, ^{then one half of that distance} ~~and so on~~,
 he must travel ^{that} ~~a half of that distance~~ and so forth until it becomes
 obvious that for every movement ~~made~~ ^{we must first complete} ~~one half~~ ^{of the previous step} ~~has to be made~~. According

to ^{Parmenides!} understanding the ~~individual~~ individual will never reach his destination
but ~~for~~ there will always be one half of the distance to be traveled. (8) Perhaps

this is a weak example (this is such a nice time to ~~think~~ have doubts, ~~maybe~~) but the

idea ~~that~~ I am trying to convey is that for every answer ~~that~~ presented concerning questions like predestination there will always follow two additional questions to ^{be} answered. This is ^{certainly} a poor note on ~~which~~ ^{which} to start a paper dealing with predestination but I did it ~~to illustrate~~ ~~to~~ to graphically demonstrate just how ~~misleading~~ the ~~controversy~~ controversy ^{over} ~~is~~ Predestination + Free Will!



is. ^{Now} ~~But when by the time that~~ However, when Luther ~~and his followers~~ decided to question the validity of the doctrine of ~~the~~ Free will his historical supporters could be numbered on one hand: ~~John Wycliffe + Lawrence Valla~~ ^{Luther} ~~Wycliffe + Lawrence Valla~~ [?]

In the minds of ^{Luther's} ~~his~~ contemporaries there was no real question as to whether there was Free will or not. ~~There was a serious learning taking place~~

~~and the members of the time were praising man's achievements~~
- Paragraph -
~~achievement~~ There was a revival of learning taking place and ~~these~~

through it attention was being paid to man's accomplishments ^{in the arts & sciences} down through the ages. Man was not a simple servant, sent ~~to~~ ^{into the fields to} till the earth for God but he was a builder, a teacher ⁺ a thinker of divine thoughts.

"The gods were not expecting to see him (man) in more shapes when behold, he was made into one of their own race, surpassing the nature of man and relying entirely upon a very wise mind.... They begged him to let him into the stalls of the gods, unmasked, & to make him a spectator rather than an actor. She was already eagerly going about detaining this of her husband, when, at that very moment, man came out and hold the ~~most~~ great Jupiter, the chief of gods, & with marvelous & indescribable gestures, impersonating his father. He had transcended the characters of the lower gods & was piercing into that inaccessible light surrounded by darkness where Jupiter dwells, of kings & gods the king. ~~Not~~ the gods, out of respect for this image of the Father of all gods, & by their own suffrage, unanimously decreed that divine honors be granted to man." (10) (ibid. pp. 389-390) - Juan Luis Vives

Frederick

It was a matter of necessity to the humanists that man have Free Will.

They wanted to depart from the ^{binding} ideologies of the middle Ages

and wanted to rediscover through the classics & science the ~~the~~ dignity of

man. Their world view ^{his} (was) that the universe (is) anthropocentric; the dignity of

man is due to various accomplishments and his unique power to reason. (11) (ibid. pp. 215-54) + that

The ~~medieval~~ medieval view was that the universe was theocentric; the dignity of

man ~~is~~ was dependant on the belief he is created in God's image - it is

desire brought forth no cheers or joy from the mouth of John Reuchlin, an eminent jurist of Tübingen & a pioneer of Hebrew studies among the Christians. The controversy came to the ears of Emperor Maximilian who ^{set up} ~~appointed~~ a committee to render his opinion. Reuchlin, as one of the members, advised that nothing be done indiscriminately & that ~~the~~ chairs ~~be~~ for the study of Hebrew be founded in the universities ~~in~~ so that Christians might be competent to have a judgment. The Dominicans then rallied to the support of Pfefferkorn & brought the case before the ~~the~~ Inquisitor for Heretical Pravity for the diocese of Cologne, Jakob von Hochstraten. He ~~was~~ gave a judgment adverse to Reuchlin. An appeal was then made to the pope, who at first exonerated Reuchlin, ~~but~~ but then, when the agitation continued, enjoined silence & saddled Reuchlin with the costs. But ~~Reuchlin~~ Reuchlin did not keep silent ~~and~~ nor pay the costs. A inquiry had been won for free investigation. Erasmus immediately rallied behind ~~the~~ Reuchlin not because he agreed with his cabalistic speculations, which Erasmus considers sheer fantasy, but because Reuchlin's actions represented man's freedom to think & to speak. ¹⁵ (Erasmus, p. 151, 2)

Just as the Reuchlin episode was beginning to dissipate another controversy of similar nature rose up. The cause was the same: freedom to speak. The opponents were the same: the Dominicans. This time the controversy centered around an Augustinian monk's protest against the abusive practice of selling indulgences. The date was October 31st, 1517; the man was Martin Luther.

Erasmus was very ^{cautious} ~~considerate~~ about helping this young monk. Just as with Reuchlin, Erasmus supported Luther's desire to straighten out the church but he did ~~not~~ not necessarily support Luther's views. (16) (ibid, p. 153, 154) Erasmus later wrote:

"Thus, then, did I favour Luther; I favoured the good that was in him, yet it was not him I favoured, but Christ's glory. And yet I saw much inside me that awoke my anxiety + suspicion. So when he approached me by letter at his own accord, I at once took the opportunity to admonish him + say what I wished him to avoid & so that his mind, corrected & purified, might most fruitfully & ~~so~~ to the great glory of service of Christ, re-ignite for us the philosophy of the gospel, now almost moribund (frigescentem). (17) (E+NR, p. 167)

It must be noted that Erasmus' relationship with Luther was one of amazing brotherly patience + compassion. Even when Luther slipped into "error" (as ~~manifested~~ the author's purpose is not to pass judgement, this is just to pass on the case) Erasmus was not

sharp with threats of condemnation. His treatise "On the Freedom of the Will" is an example of this.

Erasmus had successfully evaded the pleas of Luther's enemies to write against him ^{for many years}. Finally, however, in 1524 Erasmus took pen in hand and began his response to Luther's paper "Assertio". Even still ~~and~~ Erasmus' answer held no resounding defence of Rome & all his works, no challenge on the ground of Luther's innovations, no wholesale condemnation. It was a quiet examination of the scriptural evidence for & against belief in Free will, & he treated this excommunicated heretic as gently as if he had been a brother. This tone of conciliation ^{in total} was totally in harmony w/ Erasmus' consistent attitude in face of the ever-widening schism but it infuriated both Luther & his enemies. ^{18 (F&NR) (ibid, p. 186)}

Not soon after receiving Erasmus' treatise "On Free Will" Luther published his response: "On the Bondage of the Will." It must be emphasized that ~~all~~ when dealing with Lutheran ~~material~~ ^{for truth} material that the ~~only~~ ^{only} criterion is Holy Scripture. This shall have a lasting effect on almost all ^{Future} forms of Protestant Christianity. According to these churches: "If it's not in the Bible it's ~~not~~ ^{not} ~~truth~~ ^{of truth}."

Erasmus begins his diatribe by pointing out his dislike of assertions. He does not very lightly upon people that are so ~~attached~~ attached to their own opinion that they vent with rage and stop up their ears ~~with~~ when some ~~one~~ presents an opinion different from their own. He feels there are far too many people in that position. So for that reason he plays the role of the defensor and not the judge in this paper. That is, he will present his case, the scriptural evidence for & against ~~the~~ Free will, but he will leave the final judgement up to the reader. (19) (Rupp p. 38)

Luther responds by writing that Christianity is full of assertions. He clarifies that he means the facts of gospel when he speaks of things asserted. He says that a Christian must be willing to die for the truth of the gospel, not giving ground to vain arguments but ~~standing his ground~~ remaining steadfast by the word of the truth of the gospel. Erasmus is then accused of being a lover of peace more than a lover of truth. Luther claims that Erasmus is willing to down-play the truth if danger of disagreement is present. (20) (ibid. p. 108)

Erasmus moves on to ask ^{how} ~~if~~ one can base his whole theology or dogma on scripture alone, seeing ^{how} obscure it is. He says that previous experience teaches ~~one~~ that the deeper he goes into scripture the dark ^{or less} + ~~un~~comprehensible it becomes. He says that it ~~is~~ not for ^{answered} ~~us~~ to ask the fundamental questions that have already been ~~by~~ the ~~councils~~ councils + the church Fathers. He says that scripture itself proves this new point: "It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father has fixed by his own authority," (Acts. 1:7) ^(21 ibid p. 39-9)

Luther retorts that ~~that~~ may be true in reference to the Parousia or the establishing of the kingdom (i.e. eschatological events) which seems to be talking about ~~from scripture~~ that verse (Acts. 1:7) ~~which is not~~ but in all other aspects scripture is an "useful book" (Rev 22:10). He confesses that to some people scripture is obscure. But the obscurity is not in the pages of Divine Writ ~~but~~ ~~in~~, it is in ^{the} blindness of those who take a troubled look at ~~scripture~~ the very clearest truth: "If our gospel is veiled, it is veiled only to those who are perishing, whose minds the god of this world has blinded" (1 Cor. 4:3f). ^{22 (ibid. p. 110)}

Erasmus objects, "If scripture is so clearly laid out that no interpreter is necessary then why have so many outstanding men ~~been~~ been caught blind? (according to your teaching)?"

And if you say that the scripture is so clear to you because you have the spirit then are deny^{ing} me & the spirit also? Can such a multitude be wrong? (23) (ibid. 44-46)

Butler wanders off and says that it is foolish to believe that scripture is obscure & even more foolish to ~~turn~~ turn to the papal court for an interpretation. He then goes on to write about the ~~teach~~ internal & external characteristics of scripture & how it can be used to determine truth. (24) (ibid. 58, 9)

Finally after countless hours of preplay Erasmus settles down & starts writing about free will. He first gives his own definition of Free will ~~that~~ he gives a scriptural reference.

"A power of the human will by which a man can apply himself to the things which lead to eternal salvation." - Erasmus (26) (ibid, p. 47)

"When God in the beginning created man, he made him subject to his own free choice. If you choose you can keep the commandments; it is loyalty to do his will. There is set before you fire & water, to whichever you choose, stretch forth your hand. Before man are life & death, whichever he chooses shall be given unto him. (Sirach 15: 14-17)

Butler easily puts away Erasmus' little definition of Free will but when it comes to answering the Sirach text he gets trapped

in a maze of words.

"'Freechoice' means (strictly speaking) that which can do + does, in relation to God, whatever it pleases, unhindered by any law or ~~not~~ any sovereign authority. For you would not call a slave free, who ~~is~~ ~~not~~ acts under the sovereign authority of his master, + still less rightly can we call a ~~man~~ man, when they live under the absolute sovereignty of God (not to mention sin + death) in such a way that they cannot subsist for a moment by their own strength." - Martin Luther ⁽²⁶⁾ (ibid, p. 170)

"When therefore Ecclesiasticus says: 'If thou wilt observe the commandments + keep acceptable fidelity forever, they shall preserve thee', I do not see how free choice is proved by these ~~these~~ words. For the verb is in the subjunctive mood ('If thou wilt'), which asserts nothing. As the logicians say, a conditional asserts nothing indicatively. For example, 'If the devil is God, it is right to worship him; if a man flies, he also has wings.' If free choice exists grace is nothing." - Martin Luther ⁽²⁷⁾ (ibid ~~183-4~~)

Luther feels that the question is placed: "If thou wilt" it is a conditional clause that calls for a negative answer. He does take into consideration that four times within that passage to man offered a choice. It is a foolish argument to say that God is toying with man by asking him to perform a task that he is incapable of doing four straight times.

It should be understood that the belief in God's predestination rests on the belief that God is sovereign in his creation. If God is truly sovereign then he has the power to relax his sovereignty in order

that man ~~may~~ might ~~exercise~~ exercise his free will. To say that God cannot do this is to deny God of his sovereignty to do whatsoever he pleases in his creation. ²⁸

Wheeler then presented a ~~passage~~ passage from scripture that was just as much for predestination as the Smith text was for Free will.

- Potter + the clay Romans 9:18 - 24
... God has mercy...
... the Gentiles.

There is not ^{much} ~~a whole lot~~ that Erasmus can do with this ~~passage~~ ^{another} passage. He tries to trace the verse back to ~~a~~ passage that uses the same image; ~~Jeremiah~~ Jeremiah 18:6 & Isaiah 45:9 ff. But in doing so he disregards the interpretation that Paul is obviously giving, that is, God's sovereign right to whatever he pleases ^{with} his creation. He tries to down-play that idea by saying that Paul was really just trying to quiet the impious complaint. ^{(29) ibid p 70-72} This is ~~not~~ partially true. But nonetheless the statement is made: "Friend, who are you to answer God back? Does something hold say to it's maker, 'Why did you make me into this?'" (Rom. 9:20)

Erasmus concludes by going a spree of rhetorical questions. He appeals to reason in a question that he knows cannot be answered by reason. In his desire to appear without ~~pre~~ prejudice he makes no further conclusions and leaves the matter of Free Will + Predestination up to the reader.

"For when I ... he is immutable." ³⁰ (ibid p.87)

There is ^{being} one that remains unanswered, "why did Martin Luther go against a tradition that had ^{been} held since the time of Augustine?" To answer this question require a little knowledge of Luther's early monastic life.

Some might say that Luther was overly conscious of his limitations. Others might say that ~~here~~ is the result of dark medieval teachings on goblins & evil spirits. But the fact remains that Luther desired to be free of Dark Ages Theology that shackled men's souls in ~~dark~~ ^{dark} ~~ward~~ ^{ward} novels where God was judge. He had an understanding of ^{just} ~~just~~ ^{He saw man's deviant spirit up against} holy God is in view of man's deviant spirit. And he tried every ^a ~~back~~ ^{back} ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~God's~~ ^{God's} ~~just~~ ^{just} demands. ~~that~~ orthodox method to perhaps bridge the gap between himself and God, or at least to ward off God's judgement.

"Luther would repent ... hope?" ³¹ (Barntan, p.41)

one day
Luther was so enraptured in continual striving that when, ^{one day}
God ~~showered~~ on him his grace Luther was totally overcome.
He now saw how vain ~~at~~ all that striving had been. He could never
bridge the gap by his ^{own} efforts. It was only by God's grace that he
was felt clean before his Lord. Where once he only saw the
the drawn sword of God's judgement, he now saw the ~~far~~
bare hand of Christ stretching out to all mankind offering
healing, offering hope, and offering complete forgiveness.

- ~~you~~ ~~love~~ ~~break-thru~~ (K) 32
He could care less about his own free will. He was where he wanted
to be. He knew that in God's hands he would always be saved
to the best was always sought out for him.

His striving to know God symbolized for him free will, that is
man trying to draw close to God. But God sending his saving grace
symbolized to Luther God's ~~predestined~~ ~~will~~. ~~the~~ The awesome power
of God's ^{saving} grace, the grace that Luther experienced, was such that it total
overwhelmed his own works. To Luther his free will was swallowed up
by the predestined plan.

Roman 11: 33-36

(7) ~~11~~ Δg = Philo & AA

(5) Delaney - notes

(4) ~~crabtree~~ - Renaissance

(1) Amer Dictionary

(3) Banton - Here I stand

(2) Banton Fragments

(8) Phillips

(9) Rupp.

(6) Green -

Man himself is something good in so far as he is man,
for he can live rightly when he so wills "on free will 2.1.2"
St. Augustine p. 65

Ps. 14.2-3 All have sinned
Gn 8.21 - All were evil

I Intro - Free will & Predestination - Difficult

II Augustine - DIFFICULT! → 354 - 430

A. (on free will III/V/15) "But God did not withhold the largeness
of his bounty even from his creatures who he knew beforehand
would not only sin but would continue in the will to sin;
for he showed it in creating them. An errant horse
is better than a stone that cannot err because it has
neither motion nor feeling of its own. So a creature that
sins by its own free will is more excellent than one
which cannot sin because it has no free will.. (III/V/16) ...

B. Why, then, should not God be praised w/ all possible praise,
who made souls that were to abide in the laws of
righteousness, even if he also made other souls which he
knew beforehand would sin or even persevere
in sin? For even these are better than things
that cannot sin because they have not reason at

C. → free choice & will. " - p. 63

(on free will II/XX/54) "But since man cannot rise
of his own free will as he fell by his own will
spontaneously, let us hold with steadfast faith the right
hand of God stretched out to us from above, even our
Lord Jesus Christ." p. 56

D. "However, man existing in the here & now is not perfect
man created by God, but fallen man blemished by
original sin. According to the Christian teaching on
which Augustine's doctrine rests, Adam, the 1st man,
sinned by disobeying God's command. As a result,
his intellect was dimmed by ignorance, his will
weakened by concupiscence, & he became subject to
death. These blemishes were transmitted by heredity to the
descendants of Adam, so that all men born after him
were born w/ a defective nature. But God did not leave

Arthur Hymans, James C. Walsh, eds.
Theology of the Middle Ages (Indianapolis:
Hackett Publishing Co.) 1973

Rowlett, Baileton, Here I stand: A life of Martin Luther.
(N.Y.: New American Library, Inc.). 1950

all mankind to eternal damnation. In His mercy, expressed in the Incarnation, God freely selected certain men to be saved. These theological doctrines modified Augustine's philosophic account of human freedom. Man, to be sure, retained his freedom of choice even after the Fall; but liberty, the ability not to sin, was gone. Only the grace of God could restore (p. 18) to man his original liberty; it is the Christian's hope, according to Augustine, that those saved, though free, no longer will be able to sin. "pp. 17-18"

E. All men at birth are moving in a pathway from God.

But a shower of God's grace enables the individual to move in a direction toward God.

II Erasmus And Luther

A. "Erasmus was closer to Luther than many other figures of the ~~Renaissance~~ Renaissance because he was so Christian." N.T. ~~has been~~

1. N.T. Greek original by 1516 - "be penitent" (Rm. 7) p. 96

2. Church = Judaistic legalism

a. "Christianity," said Erasmus, "has been made to consist not in loving one's neighbor but in abstaining from butter & cheese during Lent" p. 97

b. E. said: "Those who never in their lives endeavored to imitate St. Francis desire to die in his cow." p. 97

c. E. said: "By how many human regulations was the sacrament of penitence & confession been impeded?"

The bolt of excommunication is ever in readiness.

The sacred authority of the Roman Pontiff is so abused by absolutisms, dispensations & the like that the godly cannot see it without a sigh. Aristotle is so in vogue that there is scarcely time in the churches to interpret the gospel. "The Annotations on the N.T. (1519 ed) p. 97

Margaret Mann Phillips, Erasmus & the Northern Renaissance. (N.Y.: Collier Books). 1965

d. "But there were differences: & the most fundamental was that Erasmus was after all a man of the Renaissance, desirous of bringing religion itself within the compass of man's understanding. He sought to do so, not like the scholastics by rearing ~~an~~ an imposing edifice of rationally integrated theology, but rather by relegating to the judgement day the decision of difficult points & couching Christian teaching in terms simple enough to be understood by the Apeles, for whom his devotional tracts were translated. His patron saint was ever the penitent ~~thief~~ thief because he was saved with so little theology." p.98.

B. Clearly, if Erasmus hated the Schoolmen, it was not for their fundamental doctrines so much as for their methods & their "barbarism." With Luther it was otherwise.

Doctrines didn't free him -- later. p.156

C. "Thus then, did I favour Luther. I favoured the good that was in him, yet it was not 'him' I favoured, but Christ's glory. And yet I saw much ~~that~~ inside me that awoke my anxiety & suspicion. So when he approached me by letter of his own accord, I at once took the opportunity to admonish him & say what I wished him to avoid, so that his mind, corrected & purified, might most fruitfully & to the great glory and service of Christ, reinstate for us the philosophy of the gospel, now almost moribund (Frigescentem)." p.169

D. Erasmus refuses to write against Luther until

→ 1524 (on Free Will) - is hated by both sides
p.178 "I am a heretic to both sides," p.175

Saints are
sinners?

Luther
p.153 &
Erasmus

Erasmus writes
Luther

p.157 - 8 & Erasmus

E. Gordon Rupp, et al., eds. & trans. Luther & Erasmus: Free Will & Salvation. The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XVII. (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press). MCMXLIX

The
III a Free Will & The Bondage of the will

A. Erasmus' "answer to Luther held no resounding defence of Rome & all its works, no challenge on the grounds of Luther's innovations, no wholesale condemnation. It was a quiet examination of the Scriptural evidence for & against belief in Free will, and ~~to~~ ~~he~~ he treated this excommunicated heretic as gently as if he had been a brother. This tone of conciliation was strictly in harmony w/ Erasmus' consistent attitude in face ~~of~~ of the widening schism, but it infuriated equally both Luther & his enemies." p. 180 -

B. Present statement by Erasmus, Reply by Luther - comment by me
~~Erasmus dislike A. Assertions - play debater not judge...~~

1. Assertions

- a. Erasmus dislike - play debater not judge (38)
- b. A-larity involves A. - peace in exchange for truth (108)

2. Scripture

- a. Eras. - Obscurity - deeper the darker - & don't bother with something already accepted pp 38-39
- b. Luth - clarity - ex. Last Day = don't read pp (110)
- c. ~~Christ~~ me: Christ removed the veil of 2 Cor. 3:7-18

3. Inspiration & Authority

a. Eras - how can it be tested -

- ① you say by holy spirit - in tongues or healing? why
- ② how can I judge when I hear several interpretations all claiming the spirit. (51 & 6)

b. Luther: Scripture with its "internal" & "external" clarity can - Scripture - external ministry of the word - Sophists say word's obscure - but it isn't 158, 159

4. Definition & Freechoice & Discussion of Ecclesiasticus 15:14-17

a. Erasmus - "a power of the human will by which a man can apply himself to the things which lead to eternal salvation, or turn away from them" (p47)

b. Luther (1) "Freechoice" means (strictly speaking) that which can do & does, in relation to God, whatever it pleases, uninhibited by any law ~~of~~ or ~~any~~ sovereign authority. For you would not call a slave free, who acts under the ~~law~~ sovereign authority of his master; & still less rightly can we call a man or angel free, when they live under the absolute sovereignty of God (not to mention sin & death) in such a way that they cannot subsist for a moment by their own strength." (p170)

- say "permissible" or "mutable" choice not free-
verifiability of free choice

(2) Ecclesiasticus 15:14 - The Foolishness of Reason -

- Luther Foolish argument

5. Luther weaves a web of words trying to escape

a. merit: "well done! You are an industrious & reliable servant.

Since you were dependable in a small matter I will put you in charge of large affairs. Come, share your master's pay!" (25:21) #

The story of the Last Judgement, Jesus separate sheep & goats "... Because ^{because} you, as often as you did it for one of my least brothers, you did it for me." (25:31-46)

Acts of Being in Christ not not of merits in growing toward Christ

b. Important distinction: "The N.T. properly consists of promises & exhortations, just as the O.T. properly consists of laws & threats. For in the N.T. the gospel is preached, which is nothing else but a message ⁱⁿ which the spirit & grace are offered with a view

to the remission of sins, which has been attained for us by Christ crucified; + all this freely, + by the sole mercy of God the Father, whereby favor is shown to us, unworthy as we are + deserving of damnation rather than anything else...

This little Dietrich understands of this matter is very clearly shown by the fact that she has no idea of making any distinction between the Old + New Testament, for she sees almost nothing in either except laws + precepts, by which men are to be trained in good manners. (pp. 210-211)

G. The Potter + the pot (Rom. 9.19-24)

a. Erasmus make same mistake Luther did on Ecclesiasticus

b. Eras runs for cover in Jer. 18:6 - Isa. 45:9 - says origin not meant for predestination -- alludes to Ecclesiasticus - 2nd time - power to change

c. Luther = Rom. simply misinterpreted not consciously taken from Jer or Isa - PREDESTINATION

d. Luther - "power to change?" - In Christ

C. Conclusions

1. Erasmus has presented case - ends statement by simply asking rhetorical questions:

"For when I hear that the merit of man is so utterly worthless that all things, even the works of Godly men, are sins, when I hear that our will does nothing more than clay in the hand of ~~man~~ a potter, when I hear all that we do or will referred to absolute necessity, my mind encounters many a ~~rather~~ stumbling block..." There is the further objection: What is the point of so many admonitions, so many precepts, so many threats, so many exhortations, so many expostulations, if of ourselves we do nothing

but God in accordance w/ his immutable will does everything in us, both to will + to perform the same? He wishes us to pray without ceasing, to watch, to fight, to contend for the prize of eternal life. Why does he wish anything to be unnecessarily prayed for which he has already decreed either to give or not to give, and cannot change his decrees, since he is immutable? " p. 87

2. Difference between Eras + Luth. experience

a. "This not a matter of philosophy to him (Luther), man is powerless to help himself until he is illumined by Faith..." p. 158 E+NR

b. Luther says of Eras: "How Little Doctrine..." p. 210-211

3. This "experience" that cause Luther to believe in Predestination

a. Conscious of Sinfulness - Conscious of God's "Otherness"

b. Tries every known avenue to be reconciled - Chr. confessions

"Luther would repeat a confession +, to be sure of including everything, would renew his entire life until the confessor grew ~~angry~~ weary + exclaimed, 'man, God is not angry with you. You are angry with God. Don't you know God commands you to hope?'" p. 41

"This assiduous confessing certainly succeeded in clearing up any major transgressions. The leftovers with which Luther kept brotting in appeared to ~~St~~ Staupitz to be only the scruples of a sick soul. 'Look here,' he said, 'if you expect Christ to forgive you, come in w/ something to forgive - parricide, blasphemy, adultery - instead of these peccadilloes.'" p. 41

c. suddenly God breaks through with his grace

① Christ on the cross - God of mercy

② I don't even want a free will -

③ change - fear to love + relationship

LIFE OF MARTIN LUTHER

4. Erasmus left to his reasoning:

"Here there is nothing..." p. 86

5. Freudbill?

Quote: Power 11:33-36

- ① Change - from a love + relationship
- ② I want to be in the same way as the Cross of mercy
- ③ Cross in the Cross - from a love + relationship

- Erasmus of Christendom
- Roland H. Brinton

NY: Charles
son) 1969

~~all~~ Scribner's

Joe Bustillos

A
HU 323 A
Bibliography
9/28/77

Adler, Mortimer Jerome. The Idea of Freedom: A Dialectical Examination of the Conception of Freedom. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Allen, P.S. Erasmus, Lectures and Wayfaring Sketches. New York: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Bouyer, Louis, C.O. Erasmus and His Times. Trans. by F.X. Murphy, C.Ss.R. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1959.

→ Cassirer, E., et al. The Renaissance Philosophy of Man. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.

Dolan, John P., trans and ed. The Essential Erasmus. New York: Times Mirror, 1964.

Erikson, Erik H. Young Man Luther: A Study in Psychoanalysis and History. New York: Norton, 1958.

Gilmore, M.P. The World of Humanism. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Harbison, E.H. The Christian Scholar in the Age of the Reformation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

Huizinga, J. Erasmus and the Age of the Reformation. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Packer, J. I. and O.R. Johnston. Martin Luther on the Bondage of the Will. Westwood, N.J.: F.H. Revel, 1958.

→ Phillips, Margaret Mann. Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949.

→ Rupp, E. Gordon, et al., eds. and trans. Luther and Erasmus: Free Will and Salvation. The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XVII. Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, MCMLXIX.

Smith, P.S. Erasmus, A Study of His Life, Ideals, and Place in History. New York: Frederick Unger, 1962.

----- . A Key to the Colloquies of Erasmus. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Winter, Ernst F., trans and ed. Erasmus-Luther: Discourse On Free Will. Milestones of Thought. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., Inc., 1961.

Footnote 6# An important factor that I have not brought forth is the "why" question. If God did foreknow or predestine man's ~~of~~ condition why did he give him free will (if man ⁱⁿ fact does have free will)? ~~Therefore~~ This is a universal principle that love must be given freely. Therefore if, ~~man was created~~ as Augustine and other Christian writers say, man was created to love & to be loved by his creator, he must be free to give & receive love. Hence ~~any~~ man must have a "free will" to really fulfill that purpose. ~~of giving & receive divine love.~~
^{Had it been} ~~the purpose~~ any other way we would be mere actors on a celestial stage reaching predetermined lines & never really ~~express~~ experience the purpose for which we were created -- to be one with the Father.

⑧ (Footnote) Dr. Howard Delaney,
PL 198 C: Philosophy & Concern lecture
notes, Loyola Marymount Univ,
Fall sem. 1976

Ernst Cassirer, et al. eds.
~~the~~ Valka - the Renaissance Philosophy
of Man (Chicago: ~~the~~ University of Chicago Press), 1948,
pp. 147-182.

⑫ "Erasmus," The American Heritage
Dictionary of the English
Language, (Palo Alto: Amer. Heritage
Pub. Co., Inc. and Houghton Mifflin
Co., 1973) p 444

⑬ Mike Losh + Joe Bustillos, personal
discussion on Freewill, L.M.U., October
18, 1977. ~~October~~

ONEL
ONEL
humanities
ONEL 323A

Please

Don't

Touch !!

—
—

Rotterdam

Erasmus &
Martin Luther

Free Will & Predestination